

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 2 was indicated as being allowable in paragraph 6 on page 7 of the Office Action if re-written to overcome the §112 rejection. Claim 1 is now re-written to include the limitations of Claim 2 which is now canceled. Claim 1 is further amended to provide antecedent basis for "payload" in response to the Examiner's §112 rejection of Claim 2, in paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove a requirement for the superframe to be of 6 millisecond duration, because this limitation is not necessary to distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is now patentable over the prior art of record. Specifically, as noted by the Examiner in paragraph 7 on page 7 of the Office Action, the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest merging payloads of at least two messages containing identical frame position field values to create a merged payload, and routing the merged payload to a port. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 3-15 depend from Claim 1 and are, therefore, likewise patentable over the prior art.

Claim 5 is broadened to cover not only merging of messages that are directed to an identical destination (e.g. unicast) but also to a plurality of destinations (e.g. multicast). For support, see the originally-filed specification at page 10, lines 16-23.

Applicants further note that an additional reason for the patentability of Claim 15 is that the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest that message that are not merged are positioned at locations within the superframe independent of the frame position field values within each message that is not merged.

New Claims 22-27 are believed to be patentable for the reasons similar to those discussed above.

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner indicated that drawings that were filed on 04 June 2001 as a part of the patent application's original filing were accepted by the Examiner. However, Applicants filed formal drawings on September 17, 2001 as a part of a response to the notice to file missing parts. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to approve these formal drawings.

Appl. No. «09/874,904»  
Amdt dated June 27, 2005

In view of the above remarks, all claims are believed to be in form for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 982-8203.

**Via Express Mail Label No.  
EV 581 855 920 US**

Respectfully submitted,



Omkar K. Suryadevara  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,320

SILICON VALLEY  
PATENT GROUP LLP

0 Mission College Blvd  
Suite 360  
Santa Clara, CA 95054  
(408) 982-8200  
FAX (408) 982-8210